DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 373 587 FL 800 725

AUTHOR	Schoua-Glusberg, Alicia S.
TITLE	Immigrant Education Program, FFY 89-FFY-93. Final Study of the Illinois State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant.
INSTITUTION	Adult Learning Resource Center, Des Plaines, IL.; Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, IL.; Latino Inst., Chicago, IL.
PUB DATE	93
NOTE	52p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Citizenship Education; *Civics; *English (Second Language); Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Graduate Surveys; *Immigrants; Literacy Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs; Statewide Planning; *United States Government (Course); United States History
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois; Immigration Reform and Control Act 1986; State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants

ABSTRACT

A study of the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant (SLIAG) program in Illinois, federally funded under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, is presented. The program assists the state in providing English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) and civics instruction to help undocumented immigrants meet legal residency requirements. Data were collected in a telephone survey of participants, open-ended interviews with current and former participants, and a computerized survey of providers. The student survey requested information on the program's impact on them; the provider survey focused on the SLIAG program's effects on organizations and their ability to serve the population. The report details the surveys' development and results. Sampling, data collection methodology, and findings are reported for each. Data from student surveys include respondents' background, educational history, participation in the SLIAG program, effects of participation, and future educational and citizenship plans. Data from the provider survey include details of program start-up, impact on adult education programming, the service population, support services, collaborative efforts, impact on the organization, funding and administration, and future directions. Based on these findings, recommendations are made for future adult education programs. Lists of participating agencies and the questionnaires used in the study are appended. (MSE) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 373 587

FINAL STUDY OF THE ILLINOIS STATE LEGALIZATION IMPACT ASSISTANCE GRANT

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dan Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FFY 89-FFY 93

ISSUED BY :
ADULT LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER-THE CENTER
JEWISH FEDERATION OF METROPOLITAN CHICAGO
LATINO INSTITUTE

■

ALICIA S. SCHOUA-GLUSBERG, PH. D., CONSULTANT
FUNDED BY THE ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

FL 800725

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE LEGALIZATION IMPACT ASSISTANCE GRANT STAFF

Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago
Beth Robinson, Program Coordinator
Lilly Tan, Financial Manager
Cecilia Morales, Data Manager
Denisse Djohan, Associate Financial Manager
Rocio Perez, Program Planner
Margo Levi, Program Specialist
Cecilia Marquez, Bookkeeper
Arlene Bermudez, Bookkeeper
Hector Aguilar, Data Entry Clerk
Yolanda Escobedo, Secretary
Diane Jones, Secretary

****

Steven B. Nasatir, Ph.D., Executive Vice President
Joel M. Carp, Associate Executive Director
Bert Shulimson, Administrator
Pamela Seubert, Program Director

Latino Institute
Valerie Archibald Torres, Policy Analyst/Trainer (1990)
Karen Barrett, Advocate (1990-92)
Migdalia Collazo, Trainer/Consultant (1990)
Mario F. Garcia, Trainer/Consultant (1989-92)
Norma Gasca, Support Staff (1989-90)
Graciela Kenig, Communications Director (1989)
David Luna, Advocacy/Training Director (1989-92)
Rosa Machabanski, Training Director (1989-90)
Awilda Maldonado, Support Staff (1989-92)
Maria Elena Martinez, Citizenship Coordinator (1989-90)
Mayra Martinez-Fernandez, Communications Director (1990-92)
Venus Perez-Hall, Fiscal Associate (1989-92)
Josephine Raya, Support Staff (1989-90)
Migdalia (Millie) Rivera, Executive Director (1989-92)
Dromrac Wood, Support Staff (1990-92)

Adult Learning Resource Center - The Center
Dennis Terdy, Director
Sue Barauski, Assistant Director
Laura Bercovitz, Coordinator

Instructional Resource Consultants:
Peggy Dean
Judith Diamond
Rose DiGerlando
Sandra Koehler
Elizabeth Minicz
Catherine Porter

Administrative Assistants:
Tatiana Victoria de Davidson
Monica Bustamante de Mazur

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Noreen Lopez and the Illinois State Board of Education for supporting our endeavor. We also owe thanks to Laurel Dickirson of the Illinois Department of Public Aid and Gary Dickirson of the Illinois State Board of Education for their detailed review of report drafts and valuable comments. Finally we are grateful to all the adult education staff who dedicated time to responding to questionnaires and identifying student survey participants.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction 1
A. Background of the Program Evaluation Study 2

II. Design 3

III. Student Survey and Open-ended Interviews 4
A. Sampling 4
B. Questionnaire development and Interviews 5
C. Findings 6
1. Respondents' Background 6
2. Educational History 7
3. Participation in the SLIAG Program 8
4. Effects of SLIAG Participation 10
5. The Future 12

IV. Provider Survey 14
A. Sampling 14
B. Data Collection 14
C. Findings 14
1. Start up 14
2. Impact on Adult Education Programming 16
3. Service Population 17
4. Support Services 18
5. Collaborative Efforts 18
6. Impact on Organizations 19
7. Funding and Administration 20
8. After SLIAG 21

V. Summary and Conclusions 22

VI. Recommendations for Future Programs 23

Appendix A. SLIAG Adult Education Providers and Survey Participants
Appendix B. Provider and Student Survey Questionnaires

I. INTRODUCTION

The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) established a process whereby undocumented immigrants living in the United States who fulfilled specific requirements could become legal permanent residents. In Illinois, close to 150,000 people participated in the legalization program.

IRCA also provided for State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants (SLIAG) through the Department of Health and Human Services to reimburse states for services rendered to the newly legalized population. Adult education was one of the service areas funded under SLIAG. From 1988 through 1993, Illinois spent over $35 million on SLIAG adult education classes that reached tens of thousands of students. As prime contractors, the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago and the Latino Institute administered the SLIAG Education Program for the Illinois State Board of Education. The Adult Learning Resource Center-The Center provided teacher training and administered a student hotline. Seventy five organizations offered courses around the state. Providers included community colleges and high school districts referred to as Local Education Agencies (LEAs), and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) such as social service agencies and education organizations (See Appendix A).

When the legalization program began in 1988, virtually all students enrolled in a 60 hour English as a Second Language (ESL)/Civics course to meet a requirement for adjusting to permanent residence. The goal of the program was to assist people in gaining legal resident status. To become permanent residents, legalization program participants had to demonstrate knowledge of English and U.S. History. One popular way of fulfilling this requirement was to attend at least 40 hours of an approved ESL/Civics course to obtain a "Certificate of Satisfactory Pursuit." In Illinois, almost all temporary residents under IRCA (99.5%) obtained permanent residence.

As students attained permanent residency, the focus of the education program shifted to classes geared toward development of basic skills. SLIAG funded a wide array of courses ranging from ESL to native language literacy and life skills instruction. Enrollment in the last three years of the program was much lower than during the years when students needed the ESL/Civics class. However, during the years of lower enrollment the ESL utilization rate among SLIAG eligible individuals (8%) was still much higher than that of the overall population with limited English proficiency (4.5%).

In late 1992, as the program approached its conclusion, the Jewish Federation, the Latino Institute and the Adult Learning Resource Center-The Center conducted an evaluation of the impact of the SLIAG Education Program. The purpose of this study was to examine:

- the impact of SLIAG-funded classes on the student population,
- the effect of SLIAG funds on program design,
- the effect of the SLIAG Program on local program administration, and
- the providers' assessment of the funding and monitoring processes.

These areas of interest are not only valuable to determine the degree of success with which the SLIAG program served the targeted population, but also to examine the overall implications for the delivery and design of future adult educational services to this population.

A. Background of the Program Evaluation Study

The agencies responsible for administration and technical assistance in the SLIAG Education Program -- the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago, the Latino Institute, the Adult Learning Resource Center, the Illinois State Board

of Education, and the Illinois Department of Public Aid -- assembled a research team consisting of Beth Robinson (Jewish Federation), Mario Garcia (Latino Institute), and Dennis Terdy (Adult Learning Resource Center). The Research Team worked with a consultant, Alicia Schoua-Glusberg, to develop a data collection approach. At the inception of the SLIAG Education Program, no plans were made to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the program. The data collection system designed at the beginning of the program did not address some of the questions raised by the end of the program. As a result, the Research Team and the Consultant decided to collect new data from students and providers.

II. DESIGN

Three types of data collection were used: the Student Questionnaire, a survey administered by telephone to current and former SLIAG students; a Student Open-Ended Interview conducted in person or by telephone with current and former students; and a Provider Survey programmed as a computer-assisted self-administered questionnaire (CASAQ) which program providers completed on their own computers.

The Provider Survey focused on the effects of the SLIAG program on organizations and their operations and on their ability to serve the population. The Student Questionnaire requested information on the impact of the program on students. Furthermore, by virtue of their personal contact with other students, the sample of current and former students, acting as "proxy" respondents, provided information about their classmates not included in the survey.

In the close-ended Student Questionnaires, respondents were asked to choose those response categories that best represented their answer. The use of close-

ended questionnaires permits the collection of statistics on specific items from large samples of respondents. Open-ended ethnographic interviews, on the other hand, do not yield statistical information, but they do provide more richly descriptive information that often helps understand responses to close-ended interviews. For this reason, open-ended interviews were conducted to supplement the close-ended Student Questionnaire.

III. STUDENT SURVEY AND OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEWS

A. Sampling

A two-stage sampling process included (1) a selection of program providers and (2) a sampling of students from those providers chosen. The idea of using random probability sampling was contemplated early on and determined to be too costly and time consuming. Such an approach would have necessitated using full rosters of the thousands of students served by all providers during the five years of the program and tracking down many former students who have moved. Locating the former students would have been a very costly enterprise.

The two stage sampling approach aimed to avoid the systematic exclusion of any specific type of student. In the first stage, thirty providers were selected from among the 75 that took part in the SLIAG program at one time or another between 1988 and 1993. All 24 providers funded in early 1993 were selected due to ease of accessing student information. In addition, six providers not funded in 1993 were selected to insure coverage of the full range of types of providers, in consideration of size, location (urban/suburban/rural), and ethnicity of the population served. Each of these six providers was randomly selected from among

all providers with similar characteristics. (Appendix A lists the 27 providers who participated from among the 30 providers selected). Providers no longer participating in the SLIAG Program are somewhat underrepresented in the sample.

In the second stage, with a target completion of 300 Student Survey questionnaires, a completion goal per provider was determined on the basis of the size of their SLIAG student enrollment: seven interviews from small size providers, nine from medium size, and 20 from large size providers. Providers selected and gained cooperation from current and former students. These students were contacted by telephone interviewers.

B. Questionnaire Development and Interviews

The Student Questionnaire was prepared in English, Spanish and Polish.

Three interviewers conducted the telephone Student Survey: two English-Spanish bilinguals, and one English-Polish bilingual. A total of 281 survey interviews were conducted by telephone with current and former students between February 25 and May 10, 1993, using the Student Questionnaire.[1]

Seventeen in-depth interviews were conducted between April 10 and May 5, 1993. These were unstructured interviews which did not follow the rigid sequence of questions in the questionnaire. The open-ended interviews elicited the same information covered by the survey questions without limiting the respondent to predefined answers. In addition, the interviewer probed responses for clarification and asked respondents to elaborate further on their answers. Seven of these interviews were conducted in person, while the others were done by telephone.

---

[1] Fewer than the intended 300 interviews were conducted because only 27 of the 30 sampled providers cooperated in sampling students.

C. Findings

1. Respondents' Backgrounds

Following established sampling guidelines, providers contacted the students or former students they selected randomly from their files and asked them to participate in the survey. This process was designed to obtain a fairly representative sample, though it favored students for whom telephone numbers and addresses had not changed.

Eighty four percent of respondents were born in Mexico, 12.5 percent in Poland, and a small number were Central or South American. Because of the significant number of Polish-born immigrants in the sample, frequencies for Poles and Hispanics will be discussed separately for variables sensitive to country of origin (such as level of education in home country). About half of the respondents were women and half were men, with an average age of 36 years. As a group, Polish respondents interviewed were significantly older than Hispanics, as the following table shows: The youngest Polish respondents were 37 years old, while 70 percent of the Hispanics were younger than that.

Respondents by Age and Ethnicity

Hispanics			Polish		
Current Age	#	%	Current Age	#	%
18 - 19	2	0.01			
20 - 29	75	30.49			
30 - 39	103	41.87	37 - 39	4	11.76
40 - 49	50	20.32	40 - 49	11	32.35
50 - 59	14	5.69	50 - 59	10	29.41
60 - 69	2	0.01	60 - 69	9	26.47

Most respondents (76%) were currently employed while the remainder included homemakers, and unemployed and retired individuals. Those currently employed, of either gender, worked as:

- Unskilled worker	32.4%
- Machine operator	22.8%
- Service worker	15.5%
- Skilled worker	11.4%
- Manager/administrator (includes business owners)	5.9%
- Domestic worker	3.7%
- Professional/technical	3.2%
- Agricultural worker	1.8%
- Transportation	1.4%
- Clerical worker	0.9%
- Sales	0.9%

2. Educational History

While all of the Polish respondents had at least eight years of education in Poland, 57 percent of Hispanics had fewer than eight years of education in their country of origin. Previous schooling would be expected to have an effect on future educational pursuits. This proves true when looking at the number of hours spent in SLIAG classes: over 54 percent of Polish respondents took more than 100 hours, while only 34 percent of Hispanics did. The same is true regarding the proportion of third year students from each national/ethnic origin: whereas over 20 percent of the Polish-born students reported taking SLIAG classes in at least three different years, only 14 percent of the Hispanics did so.

On the other hand, a higher percentage of Hispanics had taken some type of adult education classes before SLIAG (44 percent, versus 34 percent of Poles), primarily English. However, the majority of respondents (56.8%) had taken no adult education classes prior to enrolling in a SLIAG course. The immigration

English and Civics requirement led many into adult education classes for the first time.

3. Participation in the SLIAG Program

Classes Taken. Over 72 percent of the respondents indicated their first year in SLIAG classes was in 1990 or earlier, when virtually all funding went to ESL and Civics classes for attaining permanent residence.

While two thirds of the student respondents took classes in one year only, 15 percent took classes in two different years, and 15 percent in three different years. Only 8.5 percent were current students, while all the others stopped taking classes before 1993. Of the current and former students interviewed, 111 took their SLIAG classes in CBOs, while 155 did so in LEAs.

Over half of the respondents reported that they attended more than 60 hours of class, with 17 percent taking more than 100 hours. Statewide data collected by the Jewish Federation shows that in FY 1990, the average attendance hours per student was 54 and in FY 1991 the average was 76.

What courses did students take? The overwhelming majority took ESL (83.6%) or ESL/Civics (56%), followed by GED (8%), Literacy (4%), and Computers (2%).

Support Services. SLIAG funded educational support services including child care, transportation, counseling, and tutoring. In many cases, providers were able to offer a number of support services that facilitated class attendance for students. Twenty-one percent of the students reported having used one or more of these services at some point. Child care was the most used service (33 respondents), while counseling, tutoring and transportation were each used by fewer than ten respondents. (Of the seven respondents who used transportation services, six lived in rural areas, and one in a suburban area.)

Of the respondents who availed themselves of the support services offered,

48 percent rated those services, presumably on the basis of their observations about how good the services were for other students who used them. Of those rating the services, 93 percent were pleased with them.

In addition to the funded support services mentioned above, providers sometimes offered other types of assistance to students, as open-ended interview respondents described: "They helped us fill out job applications, they informed us about our rights if we were fired, where to go for help with unemployment or doctors, etc." "There were services by volunteers, that is, the students themselves offered their services to help those who knew less... They helped me with translations of documents."

Of the fourteen percent who received assistance of one type or another, 32 percent had translation assistance, 25 percent received financial assistance, 12 percent had help to process their immigration papers, 10 percent had legal assistance, 7.5 percent had help preparing their tax returns, 7.5 percent had help with other government agencies, and five percent received job-related help. While, as indicated above, more LEA than CBO students used support services, the reverse is true for other types of assistance such as those just mentioned, which were used more by CBO students (22%) than by LEA students (10%).

Referrals. An important step in using available support services or other types of assistance was to have information about their availability. The same is true for taking other courses not funded by SLIAG, while taking part in the SLIAG program. Of the students interviewed, ninety seven (35%) students took other courses while in SLIAG programs or received other services or help from their providers. The main sources of information about those classes and services were, in order of importance: teachers (39%), family and friends (13%), flyers/posters (10%), other students (8%), counselors (7%), providers' staff

(7%), mailings from providers (6%), and ethnic newspapers (5%).

Program Characteristics Preferred by Students. Overall, over 90 percent of the students indicated high satisfaction with the teachers, class location and schedule, and support services. Over 80 percent reported that they were pleased with the pace of instruction. Similar numbers felt positive about the amount of writing required in class. Students mentioned different aspects of the program that they particularly liked, such as providers' staff ("this one teacher's aide", "the coordinator") or class participation ("Everyone participated in class."). Others were particularly impressed with the availability of the program ("It is free") or its organization or resources ("Well organized"; "There was a placement test to determine the right level for each student"; "There was a library with books in Spanish").

Pace and size of class elicited the most negative opinions; however, only five percent of the students indicated displeasure with these aspects of instruction. Pace for some was too slow and for some too fast. While some students reported classes were too large, others talked about classes being too small. Yet others discussed the constantly changing class size due to student absenteeism. In open-ended interviews, respondents talked about how classes by level were instituted when there were enough students; as soon as the number of students was too low, one class had to include students at different levels, with consequent effects on pace. The teacher moved too fast for the slower students, and too slowly for the faster ones.

4. Effects of SLIAG Participation

English Skills. While this survey did not measure objective gains in mastery of English, respondents indicated subjectively that the classes made a big difference in their lives. What was the effect of participating in SLIAG

classes on students' English skills? Overall, 44 percent reported a "big improvement." Not surprisingly, the magnitude of the improvement increased the longer the student continued taking SLIAG classes. Thus, 57 percent of those who were in the program for at least three years reported a "big improvement," while 53 percent of those who remained two years and 44 percent of those staying one year responded in the same manner.

Students reporting little improvement, explained it as a result of taking too few hours of class or not making an effort to learn.

Life Skills. How did participation in SLIAG funded classes affect students' lives? Approximately 40 percent of the students reported that SLIAG classes helped them at work to get a job, a promotion or a raise. About three quarters of the respondents said that program participation improved their ability to help their children with school work (74%), communicate with teachers (79%), and participate in their community (74%). A couple of examples from the open-ended interviews are quite informative: "Learning some English helped me get a promotion at work in the maintenance department of a hotel. It also helped me in my daily life because now I can communicate better with others. Now I can also help my children with their homework, and manage better with paperwork and applications." "I feel taking the classes has helped me quite a bit. Now I can understand my children when they talk to me in English, as well as other Americans at work. Also, knowing English has meant that they gave me a raise. Also, since I live in a suburb, there are many Americans and now I can communicate a bit with them. I can also go with my children to school meetings, communicate with teachers..."

Increased community participation took different forms. For 37 percent of those reporting increased participation, the ability to communicate with others,

particularly their American neighbors was the main form of participation. Seventeen percent reported helping others -- primarily by serving as interpreters. Ten percent were able to start participating in community groups or activities such as church and neighbors' associations. Self-reliance, the ability to go places without bringing an interpreter, was the response for nearly nine percent. Over 6.5 percent felt able to participate in their community more fully by virtue of the social interaction they had in the classes. They met people and were able to relate to others in a way they had not done before; they broke their isolation. Another six percent reported an increased level of participation in school events, school meetings and parent associations.

When asked about the overall impact SLIAG classes had on their lives, 72 percent reported a "big impact," and cited areas of improvement: better English skills (19%), achieving legal status (14%), increased knowledge of U.S. laws and history (14%), improvement of their situation at work through language skills (7%), increased self-confidence and self-reliance (7%), and better communication (7%). Twenty eight percent said that classes had only some or no impact on their lives. Of these, less than half (37 respondents) gave negative reasons for the low impact such as not having taken enough hours of class, not having devoted enough effort to studying, classes being too easy, having obstacles to attending class, or simply the fact that they did not learn much.

5. The Future

Students were asked about their plans for the next five years in the areas of education and citizenship. While not all respondents will act on their stated goals, responses indicate areas of interest or aspiration.

Forty six percent of the Hispanic students felt it very likely that they would get a high school diploma or GED, as did 26 percent of the Polish born

students. Most Poles (65%) completed 12 or more years of education in Poland. Overall, 19 percent thought it very likely that they would get a college degree (21 percent of the Hispanics, and 14 percent of the Poles).

In terms of future education plans, the open-ended interviews give a better sense of respondents' hopes and aspirations. "I plan to study to get the GED and then I plan to continue studying and eventually go to college. My employer pays for it if it is related to my job; otherwise, it pays 50 percent. I want to study electronic engineering, which relates to where I work. First, I plan to quit one of my jobs, take another English course, and then get the GED. I think I may be able to do all this next year and then, if my employer continues to help me, I will go to college." Plans for others are slower paced: "I plan to continue studying English. My goal is to get the GED... I hope to get it in about two years." Or, "I plan to conquer the English barrier; then I want to take a two-year course in Advertising."

Sixty seven percent of the students expect to apply for citizenship and register to vote within the next five years (63 percent of Hispanics and 91 percent of Poles). In open-ended interviews, some respondents reporting uncertainty about whether or not they would apply for citizenship, mentioned a concern with losing their current citizenship.

Of all students, only 12 percent reported no interest in taking other classes in the future. Of the remaining 88 percent, the classes for which respondents showed the most interest are, in order of frequency: (1) vocational or professional training courses such as computers, auto mechanics, nursing and beautician/cosmetologist (47%), (2) English (33%), (3) Adult Basic Education special topics such as citizenship, math, cooking, and horticulture (7%), and (4) GED (6%).

IV. PROVIDER SURVEY

A. Sampling

The Provider Survey sample included all 68 providers still in existence that received SLIAG funding since the inception of the program in Illinois. Of those, 52 providers completed the self-administered survey: 25 CBOs and 27 LEAs (See Appendix A). In terms of enrollment size, the participating providers were classified into small (30), medium (17) and large (5).

B. Data Collection

The Provider Survey was self-administered by providers in a computer diskette format known in the survey research industry as CASAQ (Computer-assisted self-administered questionnaire). CASAQs constitute a novel approach to data collection in surveys, and although they are not yet widely used most major survey research organizations are developing them at present.

Diskettes were mailed to providers at the beginning of April 1993. Providers completed the survey and returned the diskettes by mail by mid-May. Some providers, unable to use the diskettes, sent a written survey responses.

C. Findings

Given the size of the sample, analysis of the data collected in the Provider Survey is best done by using descriptive statistics in conjunction with discussions of the open-ended follow up questions.

1. Start up

In 1988, thousands of newly legalized immigrants eagerly sought to enroll in ESL/Civics classes to meet the immigration requirement. Delays in federal

regulations slowed the distribution of SLIAG funds and complicated start up as some spending and eligibility policies were formed after classes began. Local providers were under pressure from pent up demand for classes to develop the needed curricula and to schedule classes. By the time the SLIAG funded classes were in place, new enrollees flooded into provider sites. Over 58,000 students were served during the first year of the program in 1988-89.

To implement the program, providers needed to make a number of adjustments. While virtually all had to revise curricula, expand class offerings and increase their staff, 55-60 percent increased the provision of support services or acquired more space. Other adjustments that were necessary for some providers included obtaining more instructional materials, equipment and facilities, and training administrative staff.

More of the LEAs (75%) reported encountering obstacles to the design and implementation of the program than CBOs did (50%). Organizational structure, staffing and operating procedures may account for this difference. Obstacles cited in order of incidence were:

Changing regulations	84%
Need for quick expansion	66%
Limited target population	44%
Administrative requirements	44%
Lack of internal resources to meet program demands	38%
Finding qualified staff	26%
Lack of appropriate instructional materials	25%

On the other hand, several program features or internal provider characteristics facilitated the design and implementation of the program. Familiarity

with the target population was the most important one (96%), followed by having an Adult Basic Education program in place (83%), the availability of staff development or training resources (79%), internal agency/organization supports (77%), and the availability of technical assistance (69%).

All the providers (83%) who had an Adult Education program in place (96 percent of LEAs and 68 percent of CBOs) before SLIAG funding began found it to be useful and advantageous for implementing SLIAG. Every aspect of their existing programs, however, had to be expanded for SLIAG: equipment/materials and class offerings (96%), number of staff (93%), staff development (91%), support services (68%) and space (66%).

2. Impact on Adult Education Programming

The SLIAG Education Program not only drew new students to adult education programs but also provided substantial additional funding for adult education in Illinois. In FY 1990, one of the peak SLIAG funding years, SLIAG monies constituted 40 percent of the total Illinois State Board of Education funding for adult education. Unlike other state administered funds at the time, SLIAG dollars were directly distributed to community organizations as well as community colleges and school districts. While SLIAG helped some community organizations to become adult education providers for the first time, most recipients used funds to expand and enrich existing programs.

The SLIAG program affected the adult education programming in each agency/organization, as shown on the following table. CBOs and LEAs were affected differently, particularly with regard to expanded enrollment and more outreach.

	ALL	LEAs	CBOs
More equipment purchased	92%	93%	91%
Change in curriculum	89%	89%	86%
More staff development	89%	89%	86%
Expanded enrollment	89%	96%	77%
More outreach	87%	78%	96%
More support services offered	62%	59%	68%
More administrative staff	58%	59%	50%
Development of new programs	42%	48%	36%

Class scheduling was also adjusted to the needs of the population, particularly by increasing the number of evening classes offered (89 percent of providers did), offering more sessions (85%), more hours of class (74%), and offering classes in neighborhood sites (67%). Other adjustments made included offering more weekend classes (33%) and combining classes with community events (18.5%). Still other adjustments cited by providers included offering specific courses of interest to the population, meeting at later hours during the summer to accommodate students' work schedules and giving more short term courses. A wide variety of short courses were developed, with Tax Preparation mentioned most often as a successful offering.

Most providers modified their curricula to take into account the special characteristics of the SLIAG population and the requirements of the Program. Over 90 percent of providers made changes in curriculum to accommodate the low literacy level of students and to add new content not previously included. Sixty four percent added material to reflect cultural diversity and 46 percent expanded their higher level offerings.

3. Service Population

Seventy five percent of the providers saw their population broadened, somewhat more so in LEAs than in CBOs. While some started attracting students from a larger geographic area, others saw a larger number of Latinos than before.

Many providers said word of mouth was a highly successful strategy in

recruiting SLIAG students. This certainly agrees with the Student Survey: large numbers of students heard about classes and services from teachers, friends or family. Announcements at community or church events, the use of flyers/posters, and door-to-door campaigns were also some of the most successful approaches to recruiting students.

4. Support Services

Nineteen percent of the participating providers did not offer support services. Among the other 81 percent, programs reported that counseling and tutoring were the most widely used support services. Students used both counseling and tutoring at 77 percent of the providers; child care at 52 percent; and transportation at 19 percent. Among the providers that reported students using child care, over half (55%) indicated that they would lose at least one fifth of their enrollment if this service were not available to students. About one third of the providers of counseling (38%) and tutoring (33%) stated that they would lose a comparable percentage of their enrollment if these services were discontinued.

Once students were taking part in the program, retention strategies that worked best were close student follow up and provision of support services.

5. Collaborative Efforts

Fifty nine percent of the providers reported having established collaborative efforts with other organizations/agencies, with mostly positive results. Responses to the question of how these collaborations worked and why, show a variety of reasons, and providers reported a high number of positive experiences and outcomes. In one type of collaboration, providers in the same area shared resources (e.g. joint recruitment efforts, joint staff development sessions) and referred students to each others' classes. Another type of collaboration was

based on common needs unrelated to geography, such as providers working closely with other literacy providers. Travelers and Immigrants Aid, a large social service agency, entered into partnership with several Latino community organizations to provide classes. William Rainey Harper College used SLIAG funds in a community outreach program in cooperation with the Rolling Meadows Police Department and the Cook County Sheriff's Police. American Refugee Committee developed a bilingual public health series and presented it to other providers' classes.

What made collaborative efforts successful? Coordination of services as opposed to competition was one reason for success. Providers complemented each others' skills and extended resources. Some providers felt the success of the collaborative efforts was demonstrated by students having been referred to them by other providers.

6. Impact on Organizations

About two thirds of the participating providers (CBOs and LEAs to the same extent) felt their capacity was strengthened by participating in the program. However, when looking at specific dimensions, the improvements in files/record management and planning and development affected substantially more CBOs than LEAs. The two thirds of the providers who saw their capacity strengthened, agreed that the new strength would have a long, lasting impact, beyond the period of SLIAG funding.

At the same time, the capacity of the organizations was strained in many cases (58%), and in CBOs in particular. Stress was felt mainly in the quick start up because of the need to serve a large population with minimal time to recruit and train staff, get space, and comply with administrative requirements.

For 71 percent of the providers, SLIAG funding allowed them to enrich or

enhance other programs they offered. For example, providers were able to acquire, and make available to other programs, computer labs, resource libraries, classroom furnishings and equipment, and additional space. In less tangible ways, increased participation, better administrative skills, curriculum ideas, support services, and improved outreach strategies also enriched programs.

Providers reported that they developed better outreach to the Hispanic and/or Polish communities and increased their sensitivity to bilingualism. SLIAG students went on to enroll in other non-SLIAG classes and services such as vocational training, employment services and college credit classes. Also, the SLIAG Program increased education providers' visibility in the Hispanic and Polish communities, thereby attracting non-SLIAG immigrants to the other services the providers offered. Curriculum innovations including short term courses, citizenship and Spanish literacy were developed and refined in SLIAG programs and will continue to be offered.

The providers drew heavily on their own internal resources to make program implementation a success. They overwhelmingly (over 80 percent in every case) reported that experience with the population served, the availability of experienced staff and adequate administration were vital to their success.

7. Funding and Administration

To access SLIAG Education funds, organizations submitted proposals in response to a Request for Proposal. Once funded, providers were required to report on services and expenditures and to maintain files documenting services in compliance with state and federal guidelines. The prime contractor reimbursed organizations for documented expenditures based on the rate set by the Illinois State Board of Education. Under this reimbursement system, funded organizations had to generate enough attendance hours or student enrollments to cover their

actual program costs.

Providers rated different aspects of the funding application process. A majority (55%) felt very positive about their award level. While 36 percent felt that the award decision process did not function well, none offered suggestions for changing the process.

Overall, 69 percent stated that the reporting process functioned well. Providers also rated fiscal and program reporting and record keeping on a scale of one (manageable) to five (burdensome). Student data reporting and record keeping were the most burdensome aspects of the program for providers. Only 23 percent rated student reporting as very manageable (a rating of one or two) and another 33 percent selected a rating of three. LEAs found student data reporting less manageable than CBOs. Forty one percent of the CBOs chose a rating of one or two as compared to seven percent of the LEAs. Record keeping was rated as very manageable by 31 percent of the providers.

When asked which administrative or technical assistance support services were most helpful, two thirds found the reporting process helpful, 86 percent found staff development helpful, and 73 percent found technical assistance helpful. The student hotline was considered helpful by 33 percent of the providers. LEAs and CBOs agreed on all these aspects.

Other support mechanisms cited as helpful included teacher training opportunities (81%), availability of written resources for teachers (67%), and technical assistance to programs (67%).

8. After SLIAG

What has been the impact of the end of SLIAG funding on providers and their programs? The same percentage of providers who offered adult education before SLIAG funding started expect to continue to offer adult education without SLIAG

funds, 71 percent of the CBOs and 96 percent of the LEAs. However, staff reductions are expected by 75 percent of the providers as well as reduced staff development (51%), and reduced class offerings (65%). Cutbacks in course offerings will affect more CBOs (71%) than LEAs (59%). Likewise, support services reductions were anticipated by more CBOs (67%) than LEAs (38%).

The type of population served during SLIAG funding is expected to remain nearly the same, with 83 percent of the providers projecting that they will continue serving this group. The reduction in providers' capacity, however, will not allow them to serve as many people.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In Illinois, the SLIAG Education Program drew in many Latino and Polish adult immigrants who had never participated in an adult education program before in the United States. Students who participated in the SLIAG Program look back on that experience as a rewarding one. Moreover, access to free classes tailored to students' needs had an identifiable impact on their lives. Students reported that attending classes led to improvements in their English proficiency and affected their daily lives positively in such areas as employment and involvement in their children's schooling.

Students' interest in pursuing an education extends beyond SLIAG program attendance. Eighty eight percent expressed interest in continuing their education, in ESL, GED, vocational/professional classes or other adult education courses. Two thirds also indicated that they would become citizens and vote.

SLIAG funding significantly increased adult education spending in Illinois between 1988 and 1993. Though many providers said that implementing the SLIAG

Program placed a strain on their organizational capacity, they also pointed to the positive impact of funding on their adult education programs. Providers expanded the population they served, increased and improved outreach and support services, created new curricula and programs, and participated in more staff development activities. Many of these changes will continue to enrich other adult education programs after the end of the SLIAG Program, but others will not.

While most students thought it likely that they would continue their studies in the future, most of the providers who were surveyed indicated that the loss of SLIAG funds would lead to cutbacks in course offerings and staff. CBOs will be most severely affected by the loss of SLIAG funds as they receive only a small percentage of other public adult education funds in Illinois.

The SLIAG Education Program provided much needed services to the Polish and Spanish-speaking immigrant communities. Not only did the program help immigrants to adjust to legal status but it also offered them opportunities to improve their English and basic skills. The knowledge and experience gained in the process of developing SLIAG education programs, that targeted these immigrant communities, can serve to strengthen future education efforts in the State. Section VI. contains specific recommendations for future programs based on the SLIAG experience.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS

1. <u>Further develop adult education programs as a strategy to increase the education levels of the whole family and to strengthen the community.</u>

Most students reported that SLIAG classes helped them to better assist

their children with schoolwork, communicate with their children's teachers and participate in community activities. Although not readily measurable by test scores, the impact of adult education on students' daily lives was apparent in student responses to the interviews. Adult education is a vehicle for helping people to become more active in their communities and to pass on skills to their children.

The importance of parental involvement in their children's education is well known. Immigrant parents who face language and cultural barriers find it difficult to be involved in their children's education. Existing adult education programs should target immigrant parents of school-aged children. ESL programs should continue to incorporate daily living skills - including "family components" - into their curricula. Family literacy programs should be expanded particularly in communities with language minorities.

A number of education providers built successful programs based on students' interest in increasing their family and community involvement. Kishwaukee College developed the Hispanic Core Group that planned community events, established a scholarship fund and organized forums that brought Hispanic adult education students together with public officials and elementary school staff. This group continues to function after SLIAG funding ended. Adult education programs should seek ways to continue the innovative and responsive programs they developed with SLIAG funds.

2. <u>Provide resources to expand citizenship programs that reach out to immigrant communities and provide citizenship test preparation, information about a citizen's rights and responsibilities and advice about how to apply for citizenship.</u>

Two thirds of the students surveyed thought they would become citizens and vote within the next five years. Starting in 1994, legalization program participants will start reaching their dates of eligibility to apply for citizenship. Each participant may apply for citizenship five years after receiving permanent residency status. Those who passed the Immigration and Naturalization Service ESL/Civics test when applying for permanent residence will qualify for naturalization without taking the usual citizenship exam. Nevertheless, according to Illinois Department of Public Aid figures, 100,161 legalization participants must take and pass the exam to become citizens. In addition to the legalization participants, an estimated 175,000 immigrants residing in Illinois are eligible for naturalization. Existing programs cannot meet the current demand for citizenship services. As legalization participants become eligible for naturalization, that demand will only increase in the next few years.

Obtaining citizenship and voting are important steps toward integrating immigrants into the mainstream of American society and strengthening immigrant communities. Funding should be available to expand existing citizenship programs and to create new programs where needed.

3. Incorporate desirable program characteristics into future adult education program planning and funding decisions.

To successfully recruit and retain language minority students - in particular, those with little formal education and low incomes -programs should include appropriate community outreach, child care, student counseling, tutoring and follow up. Without adequate outreach and support services in place, ESL programs may attract people with higher education levels rather than those who

are the least educated and most in need. Providers frequently cited the importance of support services in retaining students in classes. More research is needed to substantiate the role these services play in helping students to attain their educational goals.

Funders and educators should also continue to address the issues of class size and instructional level. These were the primary concerns of the students who responded to the interviews.

4. Fund short term adult education class offerings on topics such as tax preparation and citizenship.

Short classes or workshops that focus on specific topics draw in students who may not otherwise participate in adult education. A short class can provide valuable, specific information that will help those attending to better understand different aspects of life in this country and to act more independently in their daily lives.

5. Fund programs that target specific ethnic/language minority communities.

With SLIAG funds, adult education providers targeted specific communities, and added program components that addressed the needs of the students they recruited in those communities. As a result, the adult education utilization rate among SLIAG eligible individuals was higher than that of the general population.

To reach out to certain ethnic communities, adult education providers must tailor programs to address the needs and expectations of those communities. Some components of a successful program include:

- classes located in the community,

- native language outreach, including bilingual recruiting staff,
- bilingual staff for counseling and intake and
- native language course offerings such as Spanish GED and native language literacy, in addition to English language offerings.

Experienced community based organizations should be fully included in the adult education network. With SLIAG funding, many community based organizations demonstrated their ability to recruit students and to provide high quality education services.

6. Fund staff development and technical assistance for adult education programs.

A majority of provider respondents indicated that staff development and technical assistance were helpful to them. Most providers expected that their staff development activities would be reduced without SLIAG funds. Staff development is essential to maintaining the high quality of education, particularly in the adult education field where teachers often work part time and staff turnover is frequent.

Technical assistance in the areas of program and organizational development is especially important for newer organizations and adult education providers. However, long standing programs that are expanding or diversifying their services can also benefit from assistance in areas in which they do not have expertise.

7. Guidelines for publicly funded programs should facilitate service delivery by targeting cogent population groups and establishing eligibility and spending policies well in advance of implementation.

The SLIAG Program targeted populations based on the way in which they applied for permanent residence. These individuals were not readily distin-

guishable as a group within their communities. SLIAG service providers reached out to these individuals in Latino and Polish communities, and then sifted through applicants to determine who was eligible for SLIAG funded programs. This required detailed reporting and record keeping, increased administrative costs and created confusion for community members, particularly in programs that only served SLIAG eligible students.

8. Funding programs should encourage collaborative efforts among service providers.

Collaboration among service providers not only reduces duplication of service but also can lead to more cost effective and responsive service delivery. SLIAG providers reported sharing resources and student referrals with other organizations in their area as well as working with other providers of a similar service to share ideas and improve their programs. Such collaborations should continue to be encouraged through the Area Planning Councils which are mandated by the Illinois State Board of Education.

9. Strengthen the linkage between adult education classes and work force preparation.

Most student respondents were in the work force, though many worked in low paying, high turnover fields. Over 40 percent stated that their SLIAG experience had helped them to advance in their employment, and many showed interest in continuing their education, particularly in vocational or professional training.

Teaching English through content areas such as work related activities and situations can benefit individuals who might not learn in a traditional classroom setting. Travelers and Immigrants Aid reported that *English Through Sewing* was

a popular course that helped illiterate women to learn measuring and language skills. For those who aspire to further studies, transitions between ESL classes and vocational and academic offerings need to be strengthened.

Appendix A

SLIAG Adult Education Providers and Survey Participants

SLIAG EDUCATION SERVICE PROVIDERS AND SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

ORGANIZATION	SURVEY PARTICIPATION STUDENTS	PROVIDER
Albany Park Community Center		X
American Refugee Committee		X
Arlington Heights District 214	X	X
ASI		X
Asian Human Services		
Aspira, Inc.		X
Association House		
Assyrian Universal Alliance Foundation		
Black Hawk College	X	X
Central States SER		X
Centro de Informacion		
Centro Romero	X	X
City Colleges of Chicago	X	X
Chicago Commons Association		X
Chicago Public Schools		
College of DuPage	X	
College of Lake County	X	X
Elgin Community College	X	X
Episcopal Migration Ministries		
Erie Neighborhood House		
Evanston Township High School		
Filipino American Council of Chicago		
GRASP, Inc.		X
Highland Park/Deerfield District 113		X
InterChurch Refugee and Immigration Ministries/ Illinois Conference of Churches	X	X
Illinois Migrant Council		
Illinois Valley Community College		X
Instituto del Progreso Latino		
International Ladies' Garment Worker's Union		X
Joliet Junior College		
Joliet Township High Schools		X
Kankakee Community College		X
Kishwaukee College	X	X
Comprehensive Korean Self-Help Community Center		X
Latino Youth		
LaVoz Latina	X	X
Lyons Township District 204	X	X

ORGANIZATION	SURVEY PARTICIPATION STUDENTS	PROVIDER
McHenry County College	X	X
Moraine Valley Community College	X	X
Morton College	X	X
Mundelein High School		X
National Louis University	X	X
Oakton Community College		X
Onward Neighborhood House		X
Polish American Foundation	X	X
Polish Institute of Science and Culture		
Polish Welfare Association	X	X
Prairie State College	X	X
Private Industry Council of Northern Cook County		
Project Better Chance		
Rock Valley College	X	X
North Park College		X
Round Lake Area Schools		X
SEPPA	X	X
SER, Jobs for Progress	X	X
South Suburban College		X
Southern Illinois University	X	X
Spanish Coalition for Jobs		X
Sterling/Rock Falls Adult Education		X
St. Augustine College		X
St. Matthew Lutheran Church		X
Social and Educational Services		X
Travelers and Immigrants Aid	X	X
Triton College		X
Waubonsee Community College		X
West Chicago District 94	X	X
Westown Center for Education and Community Leadership		
West Austin Community Organization		
William Rainey Harper College	X	X
Rockford Public Schools		X
World Relief	X	
YWCA - Elgin	X	X
Waukegan Adult Evening School		

Appendix B

Provider and Student Survey Questionnaires

Student Questionnaire - Final Version (2-24-93)

Hello. My name is Cris Morán. I am interviewing students and former students for an evaluation of the State Legalization and Amnesty program in which you are or were enrolled. I believe someone from (PROVIDER) has recently been in touch with you to let you know we would be calling. I have some questions to ask you about the program in which you participated at (PROVIDER). It should only take about ten minutes. Please keep in mind that we are evaluating the entire program, and that this is not a test of how much you learned or how well (PROVIDER) in particular did their job. Also, let me reassure you that your answers will be maintained confidentially and will remain anonymous.

1. In what year or years did you take classes sponsored by the State Legalization and Amnesty Program at (PROVIDER)? (INTERVIEWER: RECORD UP TO 3 YEARS GIVEN)

   A. 19___

   B. 19___

   C. 19___

2. How many hours of classes did you take at (PROVIDER) under the State Legalization and Amnesty Program? (INTERVIEWER, IF RESPONDENT REPLIES WITH OTHER THAN HOURS, PLEASE RECORD UNDER "OTHER".)

   A. less than 40 hours

   B. 40 hours to 60 hours

   C. 61 to 100 hours

   D. more than 100 hours

   E. OTHER: _____

3. Which classes did you take? CODE ALL THAT APPLY

   A. English (ESL)

   B. ESL/Civics

   C. Literacy

   D. High School Diploma/GED

   E. Other (Which?)

   _____

   _____

4. Under the State Legalization and Amnesty Program, did you take any short courses that taught practical skills outside of regular English classes? These were courses running anywhere from one day to six weeks. They covered topics of everyday practical use, such as gardening, film, cooking, how to buy a home, how to fill out your income tax return, etc.

   Yes (Which? _____)

   No

5. Other than the classes you took, did you use any services at (PROVIDER) such as counseling, babysitting, transportation, or tutoring?

Yes (Which? _____)

No

6. Did you receive any help with legal, health, or financial matters, or with translations, at (PROVIDER) or somewhere else where (PROVIDER) referred you?

Yes (Which? _____)

No

7. While you were taking classes under the State Legalization and Amnesty Program, did you take any other classes?

Yes (Which? _____)

No

8. ASK ONLY IF "YES" TO EITHER Q.5, Q.6, or Q.7.
How did you become aware of those classes or services? (CODE ALL THAT APPLY)

A. Heard from counselor

B. Heard from teacher

C. Heard from other student

D. Saw flyer/poster

E. Other _____

9. Before you ever started taking classes required by the State Legalization and Amnesty Program, did you ever take adult education classes (such as English as a Second Language/ESL, GED, Math, Reading) in this country?

Yes (Which? _____)

No

10. Since first enrolling in the State Legalization and Amnesty Program's classes, have you taken any other classes such as...

A.	Vocational or Trade School classes	YES	NO
B.	Adult Education CLasses (for ex.: English as a 2nd Language, GED, Math, Reading)	YES	NO
C.	College courses	YES	NO
D.	Other (Which? _____)	YES	NO

11. Have you taken the INS Test for Permanent Residence?

Yes (ASK 11A)
No (SKIP TO 12)

11A. Did you pass?

Yes
No

12. (INTERVIEWER: CHECK Q.3 AND ASK Q.12 ONLY IF STUDENT ANSWERED YES TO TAKING GED CLASS)
Did you take a GED exam?

Yes (ASK 12A)
No (SKIP TO 13)

12A. Did you pass the GED exam?

Yes
No

13. Now thinking about different aspects of the program, please tell me if you were pleased, neither pleased nor displeased, or you were not pleased with each of the following:

		Pleased	Neither pleased nor displeased	Not pleased
A.	the teachers	1	2	3
B.	the pace of instruction	1	2	3
C.	the amount of writing	1	2	3
D.	the size of the class	1	2	3
E.	the schedule	1	2	3
F.	the location	1	2	3
G.	support services (such as child care, transportation, counseling, etc.)	1	2	3
H.	Something else? (What?) (_____)	1	2	3

14. Thinking about your English language abilities before and after taking classes under the State Legalization and Amnesty Program, would you say that they improved a lot, a little, or there was no change?

A. improved a lot
B. improved a little
C. there was no change

15. Did taking the State Legalization and Amnesty classes help you to...

a.	get a job or a better job	YES	NO
b.	get a promotion at work	YES	NO
c.	get a raise at work	YES	NO
d.	help your children with school work	YES	NO
e.	better communicate with your children's teachers	YES	NO
f.	participate more actively in the life of your community	YES	NO
g.	What else? _____	YES	NO

15A. (ASK ONLY IF "YES" TO Q.15f) How?

_____

16. Now think about other students in your class(es). Did taking State Legalization and Amnesty Program classes help them to...

a.	get a job or a better job	YES	NO
b.	get a promotion at work	YES	NO
c.	get a raise at work	YES	NO
d.	help their children with school work	YES	NO
e.	better communicate with their children's teachers	YES	NO
f.	participate more actively in the life of their community	YES	NO
g.	What else? _____	YES	NO

16A. (ASK ONLY IF "YES" TO Q.16f) How?

_____

17. Some people feel that taking classes in the State Legalization and Amnesty Program has had an impact on their lives, while others do not feel that way. How do you feel about it? Did it have a...

A. big impact

B. some impact

C. no impact at all

17A. And why was that?

_____

_____

_____

18. Thinking of your plans for the next 5 years, how likely do you think it is that you will...

		Very or somewhat likely	Not too likely	Not likely at all	DOES NOT APPLY
A.	Get a high school degree or GED	1	2	3	0
B.	Get a college degree (2- or 4-year)	1	2	3	0
C.	Apply for citizenship	1	2	3	0
D.	Register to vote	1	2	3	0

19. If more classes were available to you, what type of classes, if any, would you like to take?

Classes: 1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

0. None

And now just a few questions about yourself.

20. Are you... (ASK ONLY IF NOT CERTAIN BY PHONE)

Male
Female

21. In what year were you born?

19 ____

22. Are you currently employed?

Yes
No

23. What is your occupation? INTERVIEWER: GET AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE

_____

24. How many years of primary, secondary or university education did you complete, outside of this country?

Number of years: |__|__|

25. How many years of primary, secondary or university education did you complete in this country?

Number of years: |__|__|

26. In what country were you born?

A. Mexico
B. Poland
C. Other (Which? _____)

27. INTERVIEWER NAME: _____
28. DATE OF INTERVIEW: _____
29. STUDENT NAME: _____
30. PROVIDER NAME: _____

SLIAG Program Evaluation
Provider Survey
March 1993

The goal of the following questions is to understand the impact of the SLIAG program on your organization. We want to know what the effects of the program and the funding were on your organization, and on the classes and services you offer. Providers who are still receiving SLIAG funding should answer questions about "after SLIAG" thinking about their expectations for what will happen after April when funding ends. Please keep in mind that we are evaluating the entire SLIAG program statewide.

1. What adjustments did your agency make to implement the SLIAG program?

Revise curriculum	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Expand class offerings	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Increase staff	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Improve/expand instructor training	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Increase support services (e.g. transportation, child care)	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Get more space	Yes	No	Info Unavailable

Something else? 1._____
2._____
3._____

2. Were there any obstacles to the design and implementation of the program?

Yes (ANSWER 2A)
No (GO TO 3)
Info unavailable (GO TO 3)

2A. What were the major obstacles?

Finding qualified staff	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Need for quick expansion	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Lack of internal resources (e.g. file/record management capabilities) to meet program demands	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Changing regulations	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Limited target population	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Administrative requirements	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Lack of appropriate instructional materials	Yes	No	Info Unavailable

Something else? 1._____
2._____
3._____

3. What factors facilitated the design and implementation of the program?

Availability of staff development/ training resources	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Internal supports	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Availability of technical assistance/ information	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Adult education program already in place	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Familiarity with the target population	Yes	No	Info Unavailable

Something else? 1._____
2._____
3._____

4. Did you have an adult education program in place prior to receipt of SLIAG funds?

Yes (ANSWER 4A)
No (GO TO 5)
Info Unavailable (ANSWER 4A)

4A. What parts of your program expanded?

Number of staff	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Class offerings	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Equipment and materials	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Space	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Staff development	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Support services	Yes	No	Info Unavailable

Something else? 1._____
2._____
3._____

5. In what ways, if any, was the organization's capacity strengthened during the period of funding?

Capacity was not strengthened	True	False	Unavailable
Files/Record management improved	True	False	Unavailable
Better program planning and development (e.g. curriculum, training, assessment plan)	True	False	Unavailable
Improved fiscal management	True	False	Unavailable

In some other way? 1._____
2._____
3._____

5A. Was capacity strengthened only for the duration of SLIAG or beyond the end of SLIAG funding?

Only for the duration	O
Beyond duration of SLIAG funding	B

6. Was the organization's capacity stressed during the period of funding?

Yes	(ANSWER 6A)
No	(GO TO 7)
Info Unavailable	(GO TO 7)

6A. How was capacity stressed during the period of funding?

_____
_____
_____

7. What was the impact of SLIAG, if any, on your organization's adult education programming?

Expanded enrollment	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More outreach	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More support services offered	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Change in curriculum	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More staff development	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More equipment purchase	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More administrative staff	Yes	No	Info Unavailable

Something else? _____

8. What impact did SLIAG have on other programs within your organization?

Gave capabilities which enriched other programs

Yes (ANSWER 8A)
No (GO TO 9)
Unavailable (GO TO 9)

Something else? _____ (GO TO 9)

8A. Please give an example

_____
_____
_____

9. On a scale from 1 to 5 -- where 1 is poor and 5 is excellent -- please rate the quality of all the services provided in your program. Please asign zero only to those services not offered.

	Poor				Excellent	Not offered
Adult Education Classes	1	2	3	4	5	0
Support Services	1	2	3	4	5	0
Short Courses	1	2	3	4	5	0

10. Thinking about the period in which your agency received SLIAG funding, was the service population broadened?

Yes (ANSWER 10A)
No (GO TO 10B)
Unavailable (GO TO 10B)

10A. In what areas?

_____
_____

10B. Did/Will you continue to serve this population after the end of SLIAG funding?

Yes
No
Unavailable

11. On a scale from 1 to 5, where 1 equals worst and 5 equals best, how well did the following student recruitment strategies work? Please assign zero only to those strategies not used.

Door-to-door recruiting	1	2	3	4	5	0
Flyers or posters	1	2	3	4	5	0
TV/Radio Advertising	1	2	3	4	5	0
Mailings	1	2	3	4	5	0
Community events/Church	1	2	3	4	5	0
Something else?_____	1	2	3	4	5	0

12. Please rank the different retention strategies used, assigning lowest numbers to the least successful and highest numbers to the most successful ones. Please assign zero only to those strategies not followed.

Provision of support services	1	2	3	4	5	0
Student incentives	1	2	3	4	5	0
Close followup of students	1	2	3	4	5	0
Something else? _____	1	2	3	4	5	0

13. Approximately what percentage of the SLIAG students used each of the following support services? Please use a rough estimate if this information is not available.

Transportation	___ %
Childcare	___ %
Counseling	___ %
Tutoring	___ %
Something else?	
_____	___ %

14. In your opinion, what percentage of all your students would not have come to classes if you had not offered the following support services?

Transportation	___ %
Childcare	___ %
Counseling	___ %
Tutoring	___ %
Something else?	
_____	___ %

15. How was the curriculum adapted to the special characteristics of this population?

Expanded curriculum to higher levels	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Adjusted for low literacy	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Added topics relevant to different cultural backgrounds	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Added classes in other languages	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Added new content not previously included	Yes	No	Info Unavailable

Something else? _____

16. How was class scheduling adjusted to accomodate the population?

More hours of instruction were offered overall	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More sessions had to be offered	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More evening classes had to be offered	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
More weekend classes had to be offered	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Classes had to be offered in neighborhood sites	Yes	No	Info Unavailable
Classes had to be combined with other community events	Yes	No	Info Unavailable

How else? _____

17. What were the three short term courses best attended?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

18. What lessons were learned from the SLIAG program that helped to better serve this population?

_____
_____
_____

19. Thinking of the funding application process, please rank the following aspects of that process, giving lowest numbers to those which did not function well and highest numbers to those which did function well.

	Well				Not well	Don't Know
Bidding process	1	2	3	4	5	0
Proposal review	1	2	3	4	5	0
Award level	1	2	3	4	5	0
Time allowed for proposal preparation	1	2	3	4	5	0
Timing of award decisions	1	2	3	4	5	0
Clarity and completeness of RFPs	1	2	3	4	5	0
Availability of technical assistance during bid preparation	1	2	3	4	5	0
Award decisions	1	2	3	4	5	0

20. How could the process be streamlined?

_____
_____
_____

21. Please rate the following aspects of fiscal and program reporting and record keeping, giving the lowest number to those that were manageable and the highest number to those which were burdensome.

	Manageable				Burdensome
Fiscal reporting	1	2	3	4	5
Student data reporting	1	2	3	4	5
File record keeping at local site	1	2	3	4	5
Availability of information on program guidelines	1	2	3	4	5
Cash flow from the prime contractor	1	2	3	4	5
Something else? _____	1	2	3	4	5

22. Did the reporting process function well?

Yes
No
Unavailable

23. What adjustments could be made to this process?

_____
_____
_____

24. What administrative or technical assistance support services were most helpful to you and your organization?

Teacher training/Staff development	Yes	No	Unavailable
Technical Assistance/Information	Yes	No	Unavailable
Student hotline	Yes	No	Unavailable
ISBE monitoring/Technical Assistance	Yes	No	Unavailable

Something else? _____

25. What support mechanisms for your staff were successful in fostering program implementation?

Teacher training opportunities	Yes	No	Unavailable
Availability of written resources	Yes	No	Unavailable
for teachers	Yes	No	Unavailable
Technical assistance to programs	Yes	No	Unavailable

Something else? _____

26. What key internal agency supports or resources contributed to the implementation of the program?

Experience serving the same population	Yes	No	Unavailable
Experienced staff	Yes	No	Unavailable
Experienced administration	Yes	No	Unavailable

Something else? _____

27. During the time in which your agency received funding, did it participate in any SLIAG program collaborative efforts with other agencies?

Yes (ANSWER 27A)
No (GO TO 28)
Info Unavailable (GO TO 28)

27A. Please describe them.

_____
_____
_____

27B. To what extent did those efforts work? Please explain why.

_____
_____
_____

28. Will/Did you continue to offer adult education classes after the end of SLIAG?

Yes
No
Info Unavailable

29. How did/will different aspects of your program continue after SLIAG?

Staff	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Class offerings	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Equipment and materials	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Space	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Staff development	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Support services	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know

Something else? _____

30. How did/will your various support services continue after SLIAG?

Transportation	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Childcare	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Counseling	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know
Tutoring	No change	Reduced	Increased	Don't Know

Something else? _____

31. Please add any general comments you may have about the implementation and impact of the SLIAG program?

_____
_____
_____

This completes the survey questions. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Please enter the name of your organization.

PROVIDER: _____

Your answers will be maintained confidentially.